



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/772,251	02/06/2004	Eiichi Mori	042081	6493

38834 7590 01/17/2007
WESTERMAN, HATTORI, DANIELS & ADRIAN, LLP
1250 CONNECTICUT AVENUE, NW
SUITE 700
WASHINGTON, DC 20036

EXAMINER

VU, PHU

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2871

SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD OF RESPONSE	MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
3 MONTHS	01/17/2007	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire 6 MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/772,251

Applicant(s)

MORI, EIICHI

Examiner

Phu Vu

Art Unit

2871

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 14 September 2006.
- 2a) ☐ This action is FINAL. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-8 and 11-14 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-8 and 11-14 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments, see Remarks, filed 9/14/2006, with respect to the rejection(s) of claim(s) 1-8 and 11-14 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) have been fully considered and are persuasive. Therefore, the rejection has been withdrawn. However, upon further consideration, a new ground(s) of rejection is made in view of Fukuyama. A previous rejection was made in view of Fukuyama however this rejection refers to a separate embodiment, which was previously not referenced before.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-8, and 11-14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Matsuo as in view of Fukuyama et. al US Patent 6741299.

Regarding claim 1, Matsuo teaches a display device comprising: a display unit having a plate (fig. 2 element 4), a chassis (fig. 2 elements 5 and 67) surrounding peripheral edges of the plate; and a bezel (fig. 1, 2 element 6) formed on the chassis and holding peripheral edges of the plate, and a cover (figs 1-3 element 51) enclosing the back-side surface of the display unit the bezel being provided with an extension portion (fig. 1 and 3 around element 66) that extends from a side of the display unit and

Art Unit: 2871

outwardly projects from beyond an end of the chassis at a level of an upper surface of the cover. The chassis (element 67 and element 5) are integral therefore both elements are considered a chassis interpreting the chassis this way meets the limitation of surrounding the peripheral edges of the plate and supporting the peripheral edges of the plate. The limitation of support is interpreted broadly as the chassis (element 5 and 67) supports an edge of the plate (at element 67) and indirectly supports the plate through supporting another element (see fig. 2 element 2).

Matsuo teaches all the limitations of the claim except a display device that has height equivalent to the total height of the display unit and cover only. Fukuyama teaches a display unit where the total height is equal to the total height of the display unit and cover only (see fig. 3 element 100— cover) to reduce thickness (see column 1 lines 5-11). Therefore, at the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to have a display to modify the cover such that the total thickness of the display is of the cover and display unit only to reduce overall thickness of the display ..

Regarding claims 5, claim 5 is identical to claim 1 with the exception of the preamble, which recites “an electronic apparatus” instead of a display device. A display device is considered an electronic apparatus.

Regarding claims 2 and 6, the reference teaches the bezel extension portion is disposed in a vicinity of a base portion of display unit (see fig. 1 element 66).

Regarding claim 3 and 7, the reference teaches the display unit arranged in a rectangular formation, and the bezel extension portion is extends from a lateral side of the display unit (see fig. 1 element 66).

Regarding claim 4 and 8, the reference teaches an inside space surrounded by end surfaces of the display unit (fig. 1 element 4) and the cover (fig. 1 element 1), and formed beneath a back-side of the surface of the bezel extension portion, and an electronic part (fig. 1 element 1) is disposed within the space.

Regarding claim 11, a the reference teaches display unit: having a plate (fig. 1 element 4), a chassis (fig. 2 elements 5 and 67) surrounding peripheral edges of the plate and a bezel (fig. 1, 2 element 6) formed on the chassis holding the peripheral edges of the plate, the bezel being provided with an extension portion (fig. 1 and 3 around element 66) which is extended from a side of the display unit and outwardly projects from an end of the chassis.

Regarding claims 12, the reference teaches the bezel extension portion is disposed in a vicinity of a base portion of display unit (see fig. 1 element 66).

Regarding claim 13, the reference teaches the display unit arranged in a rectangular formation, and the bezel extension portion is extends from a lateral side of the display unit (see fig. 1 element 66).

Regarding claim 14, the reference teaches an inside space surrounded by end surfaces of the display unit (fig. 1 element 4) and the cover (fig. 1 element 1), and formed beneath a back-side of the surface of the bezel extension portion, and an electronic part (fig. 1 element 1) is disposed within the space.

Conclusion

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Phu Vu whose telephone number is (571)-272-1562. The examiner can normally be reached on 8AM-5PM M-F.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, David Nelms can be reached on (571)-272-1787. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.


Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Application/Control Number: 10/772,251

Page 6

Art Unit: 2871

Phu Vu
Examiner
AU 2871


ANDREW SCHECHTER
PRIMARY EXAMINER